

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 25, 2009 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks have been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-56 are pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 is respectfully requested.

A requirement was imposed under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to restrict the application to one of the following inventions:

Group I, Claims 1-12, drawn to a method of managing a machinery monitoring system, classified in class 700, subclass 103;

Group II, Claims 13-18, drawn to a method of managing a modular software application, classified in class 709, subclass 224;

Group III, Claims 19-22, drawn to a method of protecting, classified in class 700, subclass 174;

Group IV, Claims 23-39, drawn to a network, classified in class 702, subclass 182; and

Group V, Claims 40-56, drawn to a computer program, classified in class 702, subclass 188.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-12, for prosecution on the merits.

The restriction requirement is traversed. MPEP Section 803 states that if “the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the search and examination of the entire application (Groups I-V) can be made without serious burden. For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request examination of Groups I-V.

In addition, requirements for restriction are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. § 121. Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is requested.

Applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications directed to the subject matter of the non-elected claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/William J. Zychlewicz/

William J. Zychlewicz
Registration No. 51,366
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070